

JAN 30 1945

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 38, NO. 10

December 18, 1944

WHOLE NO. 1011

REVIEWS

BOLLING, Athetized Lines of the Iliad (*Scott*); PRITCHARD, Palestinian Figurines in Relation to Certain Goddesses Known Through Literature (*Wedeck*); EHRENBURG, People of Aristophanes (*Murphy*): SUELZER, Clausulae in Cassiodorus (*Lutz*); SHEPPARD, Relevance of Greek Poetry (*Gay*)

ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

Our NEW stock catalogue, Part IV, now published.
A copy will be sent—**free of charge**—upon request.

List of contents:

The Byzantine Empire

Barbaric Imitations

Mediaeval & Renaissance Coins,
from the 9th-16th cent.

Artistic Medals, from the 15th-20th cent.

Greek & Roman Coins, new acquisitions only.

Modern Gold Coins, Latin America & Europe.

Preceding catalogues were advertised in the November 29th, 1943 issue.



We invite correspondence with parties interested
in numismatics



Approval shipments gladly arranged.



**No Finer Enjoyment Than Coins For The Study Of
Ancient Art, Economy and Political History.**



NUMISMATIC FINE ARTS
EDWARD GANS

101 West 55th St., Apt. 10-F
NEW YORK 19, N. Y.

CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Published weekly (each Monday) except in weeks in which there is an academic vacation or Armistice Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Easter, or Memorial Day. A volume contains approximately twenty-five issues. Owner and Publisher: The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of Publication: University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Printed by The Beaver Printing Company, Greenville, Pennsylvania.

James Stinchcomb, Editor, University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Franklin B. Krauss, Secretary and Treasurer, Box 339, State College, Pennsylvania.

Contributing Editors: Eugene W. Miller, Charles T. Murphy, J. C. Plompe, Bluma L. Trell (In the Service: Jotham Johnson, Lionel Casson)

Price, \$2.00 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$2.50. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers: to subscribers 15 cents, to others 25 cents prepaid (otherwise 25 cents and 35 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, sixty cents must be added to the subscription price. For residents of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, or the District of Columbia, a subscription to *CLASSICAL WEEKLY* (or, alternatively, to *The Classical Journal*) is included in the membership fee of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, whose members are also entitled to *The Classical Outlook* and *The Classical Journal* at special prices in combinations available from the Secretary-Treasurer.

Entered as second-class matter October 14, 1938, at the post office at Pittsburgh, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, authorized October 14, 1938.

Volume 38 contains issues dated: October 2, 9, 16, 23, 30; November 13, 20; December 4, 11, 18 (1944); January 8, 15, 22; February 5, 12, 19; March 5, 12, 19; April 9, 16, 23; May 14, 21; June 4 (1945).

MEMORANDA

In keeping with the policy of cw of publishing reviews as early as possible, an unusual redistribution of some very interesting material has been hastily made. The coming issue is sharing with last week's issue some Comment and Conjecture on the Teaching of Greek. Consequently, the papers of Dr. Phillips, Dr. Westington and Dr. Dow, orphans without a covering caption last week, are to be considered as anticipatory elements of the discussion of Greek pedagogy.

Swarthmore College, in memory of William Hyde Appleton, Ferris W. Price and Walter Dennison, three professors of Classics associated with the College prior to 1917, is offering two scholarships in 1945, one to a man and one to a woman who desires to specialize in Greek, Latin, Classics or Ancient History. The scholarships carry a stipend of \$200 a term; it is expected that they will be tenable for eight terms, subject to the holders' high standing in college.

Special requirements, in addition to the normal re-

REVIEWS

The Athetized Lines of the Iliad. By GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING. 200 pages. Linguistic Society of America, Baltimore 1944 (Special Publications of the Linguistic Society Edited by Bernard Bloch, Albert C. Baugh, M. B. Emeneau, Robert A. Hall, Jr.)

Professor Bolling has long been a diligent student of Homer and, beginning in 1898, he has published at short intervals in books, pamphlets, transactions, and journals his numerous and varied Homeric studies.

Any book on athetized verses must be dependent on the great Alexandrians, Zenodotus, Aristophanes, and Aristarchus. Since Aristophanes is hardly more than a name, the important sources are Zenodotus and Aristarchus. The scholia are pretty well limited to Aristarchus, who wrote a commentary, but Zenodotus

quirements of the College, are: high recommendation by teachers, high rating in the Latin Achievement Test of the College Entrance Examination Board, and high rating in a competitive Latin Reading Test set by the College. Applications should be submitted to the Deans by February 15, 1945. Inquiries and general correspondence may be addressed to Professor E. H. Brewster, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania.

Readers think that other readers would enjoy a communication appearing in *The Christian Century* (61.1441) on Latin Tags. They are right, as the following sample will indicate:

I like these reminders of other days. They tell us of a day in which Latin was the language of civilized men. Students could move from one country to another without needing to learn fresh languages. When devout people put *deo volente* after their announcements they too are recalling those days when Erasmus could go to Cambridge or Paris or Bologna and hear and speak everywhere the Latin tongue. Think how much earlier we should have known the wisdom of Karl Barth or of Kierkegaard if we had lived in the fifteenth century and had all spoken and read Latin.

seems to have written no commentary and confined his efforts to production of an Homeric text in which certain verses were marked with an obelus. Professor Bolling believes that this obelus had but one meaning and that was that verses not so marked were in all his manuscripts while verses with the obeli were not found in all the manuscripts. Such a simple method of editing needed no commentary. "Aristophanes and Aristarchus revised his work, and enlarged the selection of badly attested lines. They must have seen that defective attestation is at times due merely to a superficial accident of the tradition. Accordingly they applied tests of 'intrinsic probability' to debatable lines, but did not feel free to question on such grounds lines universally attested. Consequently an athetesis by one of these scholars may be considered tantamount to the attestation of at least one manuscript without the passage attested." This puts the work of the great Alexandrians

above personal whims and bases it on the solid foundation of manuscript tradition.

Professor Bolling is strongly influenced by the parallel in the preservation of the vast Hindu epic, parts of which are now being critically edited, to believe that scribes did not drop a line from Homer, but preserved faithfully and blindly everything they had received. They might add verses from many sources to the divine poet, but they omitted nothing. This leads him to this rule of Homeric criticism, "In the reconstruction of the archetype the shorter text is to be preferred."

The bulk of Professor Bolling's book is devoted to a discussion of the verses known to have been rejected by the Alexandrians, and he expresses his surprise that the number of these lines is so small. First he discusses the papyri, and, after giving the facts, he says: "From all this I should estimate that an average of one interpolation to a 1000 lines of text would represent about the median amount of interpolation to be expected in a single papyrus, and that papyri of the earlier centuries would tend to fall below the median, and those of the later centuries to exceed it."

He finds that the Alexandrians athetized 764 lines, or about one line in twenty. Compare this with the editions of Fick, Roberts, Christ, or even that of Walter Leaf! The moderns relied on their own feelings for language or for poetry, but the ancients depended solely on the manuscripts. Professor Bolling prints in capitals: "Neither Zenodotus, nor Aristophanes, nor Aristarchus would athetize a line unless it seemed to him seriously defective." And by "defective" he means lacking in good manuscripts.

He devotes most of the book to a study of the verses said to have been athetized by any one of the Alexandrians, and in this he makes use of the papyri, the scholia, all modern editions that discuss the text, also all that has been written which applies to the Homeric text from Xenophanes down to the latest article in some journal.

Here it is impossible to quote, as the material is so vast and so varied, but some idea of this may be obtained from this sentence: "Under each passage I plan to give with completeness the opinions of the following authors: Brandreth, both editions of Bekker, Faesi, Paley, La Roche, Nauck, Christ, Fick, Rzach, Dindorf-Hentze, Cauer, Ludwich, Monro, Ameis-Hentze, vanLeeuwen, and Mendes da Costa." This is the minimum, but he quotes far more than these, and he discusses the scholia, which he publishes, all the relevant works of learning, and all references in Greek or other writers that in any way can be connected with the Homeric text.

The labor as well as the learning involved is enormous, and he assumes something like that in his reader, since he expects that reader to catch the meaning of an unconnected Greek, Latin, German, French, or Italian phrase or sentence.

It is a huge gain for students of Homer to have in such a small space so much needed information and discussions of so many passages in the Iliad.

This work is an abiding credit to American scholarship, and one must thank the American Council of Learned Societies for assisting in the publication of a book so remote from the military, political, economic, social, and recreational interests of our times.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Palestinian Figurines in Relation to Certain Goddesses Known Through Literature.

By JAMES B. PRITCHARD. (viii,) 101 pages. American Oriental Society, New Haven 1943 (American Oriental Series, Vol. 24) \$1.75

The temporary cessation of archaeological activities as a result of war conditions makes it possible to collate and evaluate a large amount of work already done in the field. Dr. Pritchard's monograph falls conveniently into this category.

The introductory chapter maps out the scope and aim of the study: to catalogue and interpret the numerous small terracotta female figurines and plaques that are common in Palestinian excavations; and particularly to examine the form of the representation of this material, with a view to a determination of its significance by reference to literary and analogous sources.

The second and third chapters are devoted to a minute, though not inclusive, listing of the varying types of figurines (249 examples) and a discussion on dates, origins, and frequency of appearance of the seven types of classification.

In the fourth and fifth chapters Pritchard gathers up the accumulated and classified data with the intention of making identifications between the female figurines and the known characteristics of the goddesses associated with West Semitic literature over a period of some 1400 years (from Middle Bronze 2000 B.C. to Early Iron II 600 B.C.). Despite changes in the body of the Palestinian pantheon, three goddesses recur, with fair frequency, in the Ras Shamra mythological tablets, the Old Testament, Arabic inscriptions, and Egyptian, Phoenician, and Greek sources. These three goddesses, Asherah, Ashtart, and Anat are examined for features reproduced, or reproductive, in fictile form.

Pritchard reaches the conclusion that Asherah, in the form of Ashirat, was at Ras Shamra the mother-goddess; in South Arabia the sun-goddess, paredros of the two moon-gods 'Amm and Wadd. In the Old Testament Pritchard considers that Asherah had become largely identified symbolically with the post that stood beside the altar of Yahweh.

Ashtart—Ashtoreth in the Old Testament—is linked with the masculine form of the god Ashtar, evidence

for which is adduced by incorporating the findings of Dr. Dorothy Stehle's unpublished paper read at the University of Pennsylvania in 1941. Anat is treated along similar lines, Dr. Pritchard concluding that, under varying circumstances, she is the consort-sister of Aleyan Baal; later becomes consort of Seth; in the first millennium merges functionally with Ashtart.

Pritchard concludes that "there is no direct evidence connecting the nude female figures represented upon the plaques and figurines of Palestine with any of the prominent goddesses." Various speculations, including those of Legrain and Galling, are listed. Pritchard adds that there is no definitive proof of identity with the three goddesses.

The investigation, with its repeated mounting climactic character, finally leads to negation, except for recognition of the figures as of yoni significance, which was earlier evident.

Conclusions affecting the three goddesses are invalidated by the cumulative effect of the number and the close sequence of statements implicitly hypothetical:

- page 65 . . . the popularity of Asherah seemed to die out.
- page 65 Her place may have been taken by Astarte
- page 65 It would seem, therefore . . .
- page 66 It may be possible to construe . . .
- page 66 Baal may be associated with Athirat, or this may be another example . . .

So again, frequently, pages 67 and 68 and *passim*.

HARRY E. WEDECK

ERASMUS HALL

The People of Aristophanes. A Sociology of Old Attic Comedy. By VICTOR EHRENBURG. xii, 315 pages. Blackwell, Oxford 1943. 25 s. (Obtainable at \$6.25 from William Salloch, 344 East Seventeenth Street, New York 3.)

In this book a distinguished foreign scholar in the field of ancient history has produced one of the most important works on Aristophanes to appear in recent years. It is, however, somewhat misleading to call it a work *on* Aristophanes; those who read Aristophanes for pleasure and for himself alone apparently produce few books on him (Gilbert Murray is a notable exception); the great bulk of scholarly "literature" on the poet of Old Comedy deals with other matters—mainly history, politics, and, more recently, economics—with which the poet's subject-matter is so largely concerned. In this sphere, Ehrenberg's book is one of the best and after looking at the index of passages cited the reader may well exclaim, "Here is a man who has read his Aristophanes to some purpose!"

The aim of the work is (in the author's words) "to give a historical and sociological account of Athenian life, based on, and illustrated by, one kind of literature in particular, namely Old Attic Comedy." This use of Comedy he proceeds to justify by arguing (1) that Comedy is, of necessity, extremely truthful about all

real facts of social and economic life; and (2) that Comedy unconsciously illustrates social life and provides more than single facts. It gives the facts merely as a background and to create an atmosphere which cannot be recovered from any other single source.

The first chapter (on Old Comedy) attempts to show (1) that the period of Old Comedy (ca. 455-385 B.C.) forms a coherent and unified period in Greek history and life, despite the sharp break, stressed in our histories, in 404/3; (2) that an extraordinarily close relationship existed between the poets (who were all citizens, in Ehrenberg's opinion) and the audience; the audience *was* the Athenian people, the poet was one of them, and the theater an affair of theirs; the poets make constant efforts to bridge the gap between the play and the public, thus drawing the audience into action. (3) On this relationship is based the assumption that Comedy pictures reality; the audience needed some familiar ground to stand on before they could follow the daring and imaginative flights of the poet. Such a ground is provided by the facts of everyday life, the atmosphere in which poet and audience are united. The mixture of these familiar facts with the fantastic plots creates the peculiar blend of extreme reality and unreality which is so characteristic of Old Comedy. Thus, "Trygaios in the *Peace*, riding on a beetle, brings the goddess of Peace from heaven, where he has dug her up. But he himself does not belong to a fabulous world, he is a simple *pater familias* and owner of a vineyard" (27). The section in which this idea is developed is excellent, and indeed the whole chapter provides one of the best introductions to the nature and peculiarities of Old Comedy known to this reviewer.

The second chapter analyzes the extant plays, not on aesthetic grounds, but solely to determine how far the realities of the political and social situation are reflected in the simple narrative of each play. While it contains many penetrating and suggestive remarks on the individual comedies, the chapter nevertheless seems likely to confuse or mislead the unwary reader, possibly through an oversubtlety, or perhaps vagueness, in its generalizations on Aristophanes' intentions. What are we to think when we are told, after a mention of Cleon's prosecution of the poet for *The Babylonians*, that "this is probably the chief reason why the purely political theme hardly recurs at all in the *Acharnians* of the next year" (p. 32)? And later in the chapter the *Demoi* of Eupolis is classed as a purely political comedy and contrasted with the "non-political" attitude of Aristophanes in his fantasies of about the same time, *The Birds* and *Lysistrata*. At this point, one wonders what Ehrenberg means by "political," if neither *The Acharnians* nor *Lysistrata* have political themes. Perhaps (if a reviewer may be permitted to hazard a guess about a writer's meaning) the explanation lies in Ehrenberg's attempt to avoid a frequent pitfall for those who write on Aristophanes' political meaning:

all too often the poet is treated as a man of fixed partisan sympathies in the political struggles of his time. In this case, Ehrenberg is trying to make clear that neither play is meant to recommend the program of any political party (if "parties" in the modern sense of the word even existed) and that peace is advocated in both plays not for the political advantage of any particular, partisan group (as for example, the oligarchs of 411, who were eager to come to terms with Sparta in order to maintain their control over Athens) but for the private and material welfare of the individual citizens. If this is what the author means in saying that *The Acharnians* is non-political, most readers will, I believe, agree.

In the analysis of *The Knights* there is considerable lack of clarity, and there is much that seems doubtful. While it is true that the last part of the play brings out its inner meaning, it does not necessarily follow that all Aristophanes desired was to put an end to political corruption: he also wanted to put an end to the state indemnities for political service, reserving the available funds for military expenditures; and it was only the ultra-conservatives who considered the political indemnities as corruption. Further, I cannot agree that "the poet suppresses all mention of the war in which Athens was then engaged," either in the body of the play or in the ending.

On the whole Ehrenberg's opinion of Aristophanes' political tendency is a high one, and I quote with approval his description of the poet's ideal: "He stood not only for the supremacy of politics as such, which had been taken for granted in earlier times, but also for the supremacy of a new type of politics, conforming to a universal moral ideal rather than merely serving the brutally won advantage of the moment" (36).

In the later plays Ehrenberg sees an increasing preoccupation with the material and economic well-being of the individual ("the victory of the unpolitical man"), although in *The Birds* "the escape from the state is succeeded by the foundation of a new state. The goal, the achievement of the non-political life, is to be approached only by the path of true politics" (44). But by the time of *Lysistrata* "the ideal of a peaceful and carefree existence has become the vital principal and basis of life as a whole" (47). It is, by the way, hard to believe that these words are meant to apply to the Athenian people as a whole, in view of their remarkable endurance and tenacity during the years 412-403. At any rate, in the plays of the fourth century the change in attitude is clearly revealed; economic and social problems have ousted politics from comedy, and the victory of the non-political man, the 'Zoon Oikonomikon,' is complete. Further, the *Plutus* confirms a fact which is known from other sources, the gradual pauperization of the small farmers and the creation of a rural proletariat. Ehrenberg sums up this remarkable chapter in the following words (55): "Thus the last day of Aristophanes

is of special interest for us . . . It shows us the completion of the great change which we have so often noted in its earlier stages, the change from a political to an economic outlook, from the political consciousness of a citizen to the economic purpose of an individual human being. We must not forget that this change was closely linked with individualisation of life and mind which is typical of the period. Social life became private life."

I have dwelt at length on this chapter because it provides the clue to the understanding of the impressive collection of material in the succeeding chapters, which give detailed, fully documented studies of *The Farmers*, *The Upper Classes*, *Traders and Craftsmen*, *Citizens and Foreigners*, *Slaves*, *Family and Neighbours*, *Money and Property*, *Religion and Education*, *War and Peace*, *Economics and the State*, and finally, *The People and the State*. Before entering upon these chapters, the reader would be well advised to read Ehrenberg's own excellent summary of his findings (255-9). Many of his conclusions merely confirm the evidence of other sources, but others correct or controvert certain one-sided views of other writers on ancient economics. It is, of course, impossible to summarize here Ehrenberg's detailed treatment or even to indicate his many conclusions. I shall mention here merely a few special points which were noted down during a second reading of these chapters.

The evidence of Comedy suggests that a large proportion of the Attic population was directly concerned with farming. This may be true, but the evidence of Comedy alone is slightly weakened by the fact that almost all Aristophanes' plays were produced during the war when the farmers were crowded into the city; if the rural outlook predominated in town, this is only to be expected. The growing opposition between town and country, which Ehrenberg notes as one of the salient facts in his treatment of the farmers, appears to be strong in the first Comedy, *The Acharnians*. A propos of paederasty as the characteristic privilege of the nobles, one must remember that Aristophanes at one time or another accuses everyone of this vice, especially the politicians.

The discussion of the terms *kapelos* (retailer), *emporos* (trader), and *naukleros* (shipowner) is detailed and interesting. The low esteem in which the retailers were held by the public helps to explain the comic method of degrading Cleon and the other successors of Pericles: they are called "sellers" of something rather than manufacturers. The "decree-seller" of *The Birds*, however, is meant as a satiric jibe at the venality of politicians in general and corresponds to nothing in real economic life, as C. N. Jackson showed in an article some years ago (HSCPPh 30 [1919] 89-102). The whole chapter on *Traders and Craftsmen* is most interesting and repays several readings; and Ehrenberg seems to prove his point, viz., the existence of a broad middle class which,

despite differences of wealth, formed a social unit. The Paphlagonian (Cleon) and the Sausage-seller of *The Knights*, though one was rich and the other poor, stand on the same social level. This unity of the bourgeoisie extends to include the metics, whose domination of the economic life of Athens, Ehrenberg thinks, has been much exaggerated.

On the much debated question of slavery, Ehrenberg joins with the majority of recent scholars in laying the ghost of "slave economy." He points out, however, that social life was unimaginable without slaves, and Comedy gives the impression that every household, no matter how poor, had at least one slave. If true, this fact would increase our estimate of the proportion of slaves in the total population of Attica. Comedy reflects life in representing foreign slaves as outnumbering Greek ones and females as more numerous than males. Comedy also corrects the one-sided statement of the Old Oligarch that the slaves in Athens approximated the position of free men. One may question Ehrenberg's argument that the comic slave was developed as a dramatic necessity, "the buffoon who was hardly to be found among the characters of bourgeois level." Many citizen-characters play the buffoon in Aristophanes, notably Euelpides in *The Birds*, who has hardly any other function after the prologue.

Another minor point to query is the statement that "one of the results of the Periclean Age was that Athens had given up the soldierly traditions of the past" (211); this is true, at most, only of the hoplite levy. Further on we read, "to exalt the heroic and military type of Athenian citizen, it was necessary to go back almost a century, the reason being . . . that war had broken out after a long period of peace" (212). But how about Myronides, Phormio (*Lys.* 801-4), and even Lamachus, who finally gets his due as a warrior in *Thesm.* 841? It seems more probable that Aristophanes usually harked back to the age of the Persian Wars for his warrior heroes because of his Panhellenic sentiments; the landwars of the middle of the century were not forgotten, but since they were fought mainly against Greek states, they are lightly passed by.

I shall give the wrong impression, however, if I dwell too long on questions like these, since the general excellence of these later chapters is striking. Ehrenberg gives a detailed and well-documented picture of the average Athenian as we see him through Comedy: the average citizen belonged to the "middle class" and lived on his earnings, not on property; Athens was mainly peopled by those who had to work for a living. The public payments, or indemnities for time spent in political activities, did not relieve the bulk of the citizens from the necessity of other work, as is sometimes supposed; the lure of such payments was less than is commonly believed and as time went on increasing numbers of citizens preferred to turn away from political service to economic life. Although Aristophanes

himself opposed this development, he and all Comedy were unconsciously involved in it. Far from being aloof or above the life around it, "Comedy was influenced by the economic and rationalist spirit of the age in a much higher degree than one would be inclined to believe in view of its general attitude and especially its criticism of the new tendencies" (259).

Misprints and slips are few: one wonders if the reference to the *Lysistrata* on page 27 is an error; the *Ecclesiazusae* suits the context better. The indecent insinuations of the Spartan ambassador in *Lys.* 1112ff. probably refer to the statue of Diallage, not to *Lysistrata*. The notes are unusually full and contain a host of useful references, including almost all the important work on Aristophanes and Old Attic Comedy of the past twenty years.

CHARLES T. MURPHY

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

The Clausulae in Cassiodorus. By SISTER MARY JOSEPHINE SUELZER. xv, 47 pages. Catholic University Press, Washington 1944 (The Catholic University of America Studies in Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Language and Literature, Vol. XVII)

A significant addition to the Catholic University of America series of Studies in Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Language and Literature under the general direction of Professor Roy J. Deferrari has been made in the dissertation of Sister Mary Josephine Suelzer on *The Clausulae in Cassiodorus*. This careful analysis of the prose rhythms in the works of Cassiodorus promises well to fulfill the author's hope that it "will find a place among the preliminary materials needed for an authoritative interpretation of the man who 'sits on the threshold between two ages and looks before and after'."

The introductory chapter presents a clear outline of the general method of procedure. The system of classification employed was originally developed by Zielinski but was modified by a succession of scholars and finally standardized and adopted by the Catholic University Latinists who have concerned themselves with the clausulae in the late Latin and patristic writings. There follow tables indicating the distribution of the clausulae, considered both metrically and accentually, in the *Variae* in Mommsen's edition, in the *Institutiones* in Mynors' edition, in the *De anima*, the *Expositio in Psalterium*, and part of the *Complexiones in epistulis Sancti Pauli* in the Garet edition reprinted in Migne's *Patrologia*. Two tables summarize the results and present a graphic comparison of percentages of the frequency of the occurrences of the various clausulae, metrical and accentual, in the several works considered. Because of the highly technical nature of the *De orthographia* (in the edition of Keil's *Grammatici Latini*), and because of the strong possibility that it

contains verbatim borrowings from earlier writers, it is examined separately and the clausulae frequencies are compared to those in the other works. To complete the picture, the works appended to Mommsen's edition of the Variae, namely the Orationes and the Acta synodorum habitatarum Romae are examined for clausulae preferences, but the author attaches slight importance to the results. There is an analysis of the prose rhythms in the Historia ecclesiastica tripartita, a Latin translation from the Greek made by Epiphanius under the direction of Cassiodorus, to discover any possible stylistic influence. The results appear to be negative.

The Variae is singled out for more detailed study in the second chapter. The choice of this work rather than the Institutions for a close analysis may have been made because Mommsen's good text was available, because the letters are more consciously written as literary pieces, or because in the Institutions "plus utilitatis invenies quam decoris." One might have chosen the Institutions for equally good reasons: the superbly edited text of Mynors, and Cassiodorus' own statement about the Variae, "Necesse nobis fuit stylum non unum sumere, qui personae variae suscepimus admonere." Problems singled out for special consideration in the clausulae of the Variae include the distribution of the metrical forms under the accentual, and the typology of the accentual forms. The question of elision and hiatus, doubtful quantities, the quantity of final syllables, syncopated forms, and hyperbaton are discussed. The importance of the clausulae to textual emendation is demonstrated. Interior rhythms are discussed and compared to the final clausulae.

A third chapter is composed of a series of comparisons. The frequencies of the chief metrical forms in Cassiodorus are compared with corresponding frequencies in ametrical prose and in other Latin authors. The frequencies of the chief types of the *cursus* forms in Cassiodorus are set beside the frequencies of the same forms in the classical Latin authors and in the late Latin writers. However, the author cautions against putting too much weight upon the conclusions because of the varying methods used in obtaining the statistics.

In interpreting the results of her investigation, the author draws some significant conclusions. Of the 9837 endings observed in the five works of Cassiodorus, all but one single ending form accentual clausulae, and 93 per cent form metrical clausulae as well. Hence it is evident that in writing his clausulae, Cassiodorus considered accent primarily. All his five most numerous metrical clausulae lend themselves easily to the *cursus*.

Cassiodorus did not feel absolutely bound by the rules for word division in the clausulae, though 89 per cent of the cases observe it. This is a high percentage as compared to an average of 49 per cent in the classical authors; it is surpassed only in the works of Ammianus Marcellinus, Leo the Great, and Pomerius in the group of post-classical writers who have been studied thus far.

This study should prove of value generally to the field of medieval Latin style, and specifically to the writings of Cassiodorus. The scholar who undertakes to make a new edition of the *De anima* and the *Expositio in Psalterium* should find it invaluable.

CORA E. LUTZ

WILSON COLLEGE

The Relevance of Greek Poetry. By J. T. SHEPPARD. 32 pages. Oxford University Press, London 1943 (The Presidential Address delivered to the Classical Association in the Regent House at Cambridge on 14th April 1943) \$0.25

The Provost of King's College, Cambridge, spoke familiarly to his fellow classicists on a theme lying close to their deepest and most abiding interests. The tone of the address is struck in the opening idea that wisdom has an affinity for freedom, honesty, and love of beauty, and that it is best sought in the company of friends. This union of wisdom with friendship was first revealed to the poets of Greece. "The secret of the miracle of Greece" lies in *Odyssey VI.119ff*: "Ah me, what sort of people live here? Are they savage, arrogant and cruel, and unjust? Or are they friends to strangers, men of a god-fearing mind?" "It was through faith in the pursuit of wisdom, justice, human kindness, that Homer educated Greece, and Greece, with Rome and Palestine, the modern world" (7).

In an interlude of reminiscence about the room in which he was delivering his lecture, the author showed how education at Cambridge, seeking for 'efficiency,' had become estranged from the Muses. Chaucer was a true poet, but after him English poetry lapsed into a dark age. Erasmus was a principal cause of the poetic renaissance by his teaching of Greek and by his enthusiastic search for the truth in all realms of thought. The great Dutch humanist failed in his fight against "war and humbug," but today we need his clear, courageous vision.

Here the author anticipates the objection that all this has no relevance to poetry by implying that Erasmus was fundamentally a poet because of his imagination. In thus taking the word 'poet' in its etymological sense, Professor Sheppard indefinitely extends its use to include More, Colet, Cheke and Ascham as co-laborers in the same vineyard as Shakespeare, Marlowe, Ben Jonson, and Milton (23).

"But we still need Greek," says the author, "especially Greek poetry from Homer to the Gospels. Even a very little Greek helps much. Greek poetry is the poetry of freedom, friendship, reason." When the planners of a new world would reject Greek because we have no leisure for it, he would remind them of the practical, scientific Harvey, discoverer of the circulation of the

blood, who quoted Terence "to explain what scientific method really is." ;

Professor Sheppard defends Pope's translation of the Iliad and disparages Bentley's famous verdict: "A very pretty poem, but we must not call it Homer." Professor Sheppard readily admits that Pope's translation is not what Homer said to us. "We must still go back to the Greek." In spite of what the poets and essayists have done for us in translating and interpreting Greek, in spite of the Public Schools, the author thinks that the poorer children of England are being deprived of a knowledge of Greek, a part of their rightful heritage (27).

In a sort of digression there are some appreciative paragraphs on Aristophanes. The dramatist's feelings and intentions in *The Frogs* are analyzed and it is suggested that something could be said in defense of Euripides, several of whose statements are quoted and praised. The attempt is made to hold the scales even, but it finally breaks down. The wisdom, the higher

ethics, and the noble religious feeling of Aeschylus holds the more vital message for the gallant men and women of today (32).

This slender brochure of 32 pages is no attempt specifically to define or to illustrate the relevance of Greek poetry. It is the address of a Greek scholar to Greek scholars, full of appreciative reminiscences of Cambridge and especially of her great classical teachers. It touches rather lightly and incidentally upon the theme of relevancy, yet to one trained in the English classical tradition, the message is more richly suggestive than is that of most of our efforts to recommend the classics. What impresses me most is Professor Sheppard's conviction that at least some knowledge of Greek should be given to even the poorer children of England; and his further conviction that in doing this England would be choosing perhaps the best method of instilling into these children a love of truth and beauty: a love of England.

FRANK ROY GAY

BETHANY COLLEGE, WEST VIRGINIA

ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

This department is conducted by Professor Charles T. Murphy of Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey. Correspondence concerning abstracts may be addressed to him.

ANCIENT AUTHORS

New Testament. CAMPBELL BONNER. *Note on Mark* 6.20. *ητόπει* should be read, in the sense of "raise a question," a meaning well attested in philosophical contexts.

HThR 37 (1944) 41-4

(Walton)

Old Testament. CHARLES C. TORREY. *The Older Book of Esther.* The Greek compilations which exist in two distinct forms, were not derived from the Hebrew, but from an original in Aramaic, now lost. The study of the three existing forms of the story makes it possible to trace its history and development, and to answer certain questions which have long puzzled students of the Hebrew book.

HThR 37 (1944) 1-40

(Walton)

Parthenios. P. PFEIFFER. *Parthenios' Arete.* A New Attribution. Pap. Geneva 97, supposed to be a fragment from the Aitia of Callimachus, is referred to the Arete of the Nicaean elegiac poet Parthenios. This fragment may perhaps belong to the same manuscript as a British Museum fragment (Milne, Cat. Lit. Pap. in the B.M., no. 64). The nature of the poem, an *ἐπικύρων* of some length about a particular woman, enlarges our ideas of the influence of this poet, whose *floruit* was in the first third of the first century B.C., on the Roman elegiac poets.

CQ 37 (1943) 23-32

(W. Wallace)

Tacitus. G. B. A. FLETCHER. *Tacitea.* Textual and interpretative notes on Annals i.314; i.36.1; i.42.4; i.62.1; iii.57.1; iv.41.1; xi.30.1; xiv.37.1; xv.40.1; Histories i.57.2; i.64.2; i.84.3; iii.23.2.

CQ 37 (1943) 90-2

(W. Wallace)

Theocritus. A. S. F. GOW. ΗΡΑΚΑΗΣ ΑΕΟΝΤΟΦΟΝΟΣ (*Theoc.* Id. XXV). It is argued that certain oversights or inconsistencies in description which are characteristic of Theocritus support the attribution to

him of this doubtful poem, and that similarities of odd language to Bacchylides' poem on a different labor of Herakles indicate its inspiration.

CQ 37 (1943) 93-100

(W. Wallace)

Theocritus. Idyll XXIV—*Stars and Doors.* The time of year described here is probably February, and there may be a reference to some anniversary of Ptolemy Philadelphus. The author points out the difficulty in understanding the construction of the doors through which the snakes sent by Hera went to attack Herakles in his cradle, and that the architecture of the palace is not clear.

CQ 36 (1942) 104-10

(W. Wallace)

Tibullus. W. S. MAGUINNESS. *Notes on the Corpus Tibullianum.* Textual criticism of I.i.17-8; I.v.59-60; I.viii.51-4; II.iii.31-2; II.iii.61-3; III.xii.19-20.

CQ 39 (1944) 31-2

(W. Wallace)

The Singular Use of Nos in the Corpus Tibullianum. Summary of conclusions of previous studies of singular *nos* in Catullus and Virgil. Corpus Tibullianum reveals the same categories as those found in Virgil; analysis and illustration of each: (1) Plural of Proprietorship; (2) Social and Domestic Plural, expressive familiarity, not intimacy or possession; (3) Authorship; (4) Pluralis Modestiae; (5) Pleading or Requesting; (6) Pathos, Self-Pity or Complaint. More elaborate analysis of (6), commonest usage in poets studied; contribution of plural form to nuance and in some cases to intelligible interpretation, e.g. Tibullus 2.4.5.

Hermathena 63 (1944) 27-46

(Taylor)

EPIGRAPHY. PAPYROLOGY

Hyatt, J. P. *The Writing of an Old Testament Book.* The materials and procedure used by ancient scribes did not vary greatly down through the centuries. Papyrus was probably the most common writing material in Palestine from the time of the Hebrew Conquests down to the end of the composition of the Old Testament. There is also ground for thinking that most Old Testament books were written on papyrus.

Biblical Archaeologist 6 (1943) 71-80

(Upson)